

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested. For the sake of clarity, applicants will not repeat their previous arguments but instead incorporate them herein by reference.

In the last rejection, the Examiner cites Goodwin in rejecting the independent claims. Specifically, at page 3, last 3 lines, the Examiner states “a plurality of times through the single address in response to the one read or write request from the CPU (successive reads, column 10, lines 46 - 58).” The Examiner is again misinterpreting Goodwin.

The feature of Goodwin, which the Examiner continues to misinterpret, is discussed beginning at column 9, line 57. “[W]hen a *read access* is made using a row address and RAS, any of the columns of this row may then be accessed (without asserting a new row access) *by merely toggling CAS and asserting a new column address*, as illustrated in FIG. 9. The page mode access time is much shorter than RAS-CAS access time” (col. 9, lines 61 - 68). Referring to FIG. 9, the only difference between a standard read cycle and a page mode read cycle is that a new row access (RAS) does not have to be asserted during successive read accesses. But, these “successive read accesses” still require “*toggling CAS and asserting a new column address*.” The “successive read accesses” are still the result of additional read requests. There is nothing disclosed or implied in Goodwin that one read request results in a plurality of accesses as specifically claimed. As specifically disclosed in Goodwin, successive page mode reads (i.e. multiple read requests) can be made to the same one-way interleaved DRAM, “at substantially higher performance than if a corresponding number of entries were to be filled using a full RAS-CAS read cycle for each entry” (col. 10, lines 55 - 57) Thus, each page mode read is still in response to a separate read request but the access time is much shorter because a new row access does not have to be asserted – but each access is still in response to a second or third or fourth read request because a new column address is asserted.

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application. Since the Examiner’s rejections continue to be based on a misinterpretation of Goodwin, if the Examiner intends to make the next rejection final, a telephone interview between the undersigned, the Examiner,

and the Examiner's supervisor is hereby requested prior to mailing of the next office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Watson/

Mark P. Watson

Registration No. 31,448

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 952-6124
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: June 25, 2008